DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 937 HE 025 998

TITLE	The Colorado Commission on Higher Education Implementation of House Bill 1187. Colorado Commission on Higher Education Master Plan Background Paper.
INSTITUTION	Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Denver.
PUB DATE	Sep 92
NOTE	15p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Admission Criteria; Educational Finance; *Educational Legislation; Educational Quality; Extension Education; Higher Education; Incentive Grants; Long Range Planning; Program Implementation; Retrenchment; State Agencies; State Departments of Education; *State Legislation; State Standards; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*Colorado; *House Bill 1187 (Colorado 1985); Tuition Reciprocity

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews progress on Colorado's Postsecondary Education Master Plan which forms the policy direction of the state's higher education system. In particular it reviews the Colorado Commission on Higher Education's (CCHE) implementation of Colorado State legislative House Bill 1187 (HB1187). Each major section of the legislation is presented with background, statutory directive, CCHE response, and a summary. The review suggests that some sections might be eliminated because they are overly specific, obsolete, or no longer serve the purpose for which they were adopted. Also identified are sections that may need to be strengthened, updated, or amended. The legislation's sections include the following: (1) finance and appropriations; (2) capital construction and long-range planning; (3) program approval, review, reduction and discontinuance; (4) admission standards; (5) tuition reciprocal agreements; (6) off-campus programs; (7) systemwide planning; (8) accountability; and (9) programs of excellence. A conclusion argues that CCHE has been successful in developing policies, procedures and studies that satisfy the major directives and reinforce the goals of HB1187. This section also argues that some areas of legislation may need revision if the state's fiscal resources continue to decline and if amendments to the state's constitution force change in higher education policy. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED351937

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION MASTER PLAN BACKGROUND PAPER:

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education Implementation of House Bill 1187

Colorado Commission on Higher Education
1300 Broadway, Second Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 866-2723
David A. Longanecker, Executive Director

HE 025998

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CO Comm on H.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

House Bill 1187 from the 1985 Legislative Session identified the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) as the primary agency responsible for implementation of the legislation's expressed directives and reforms. In the seven years since the passage of this significant legislation, CCHE, with the assistance of the governing boards, has fulfilled its charge by responding to the major directives outlined in the legislation. Nevertheless, much has changed in Colorado since the 1985 General Assembly fashioned HB1187. While goals of the legislation (admission standards, program review and approval, accountability, etc.) have directed CCHE efforts over the past seven years, now may be the appropriate time to reaffirm certain goals and set new sights for the years ahead.

The purpose of this paper is to strengthen the current Postsecondary Master Plan discussion of where Colorado higher education should be headed by briefly reviewing what has been accomplished. In this paper each major section of HB1187 is presented in terms of the background, statutory directive, CCHE response, and summary. This review will suggest those sections of HB1187 that might possibly be eliminated because they are overly specific, obsolete, or no longer serve the purpose for which they were adopted. Also identified are sections that may need to be strengthened, updated, or amended. And finally, the absence of statutory direction on certain issues of statewide concern may suggest new areas of focus for CCHE and the General Assembly.

FINANCE AND APPROPRIATIONS
(Sections 23-1-104 and 105, C.R.S.)

HISTORY

Prior to HB1187, each governing board and the Joint Budget Committee signed an agreement known as the Memorandum of Understanding. The governing boards received single line appropriations, the authority to set tuition, and spend unexpended cash to the next fiscal year.

DIRECTIVE

The Commission role regarding appropriations was significantly expanded through HB1187. Sections 23-1-104 and 105 strengthened the coordinating authority of CCHE by granting it powers of budgetary advice to the General Assembly and control over the allocation formula to determine the funding level for each board. Specifically, the statute requires CCHE, after consultation with the governing boards, to develop an allocation system that is sensitive to: role and mission differences among institutions; costs that are fixed and those that vary with enrollment; and with an emphasis on the need for decentralized financial decision making and stability of funding.

RESPONSE

Since the passage of HB1187, CCHE has met its responsibilities for advising the General Assembly on budgetary issues and for developing and utilizing a formula for distributing state General Fund appropriations to the governing boards. For the first four years (FY 1987-91), state funding for the governing boards increased by 28% as CCHE worked with the governing boards and the General Assembly to increase Colorado's financial ranking relative to the support other states provide to their higher education systems. By the fall of 1990, however, enrollment had grown by over 18%. This increase, combined with inflation, reduced the benefit per student of the General Assembly's 28% increase.

In every year since the passage of HB1187, CCHE has complied with the statutory mandate that the allocation formula be developed after consultation with the governing boards. In most of the years, CCHE has achieved agreement among all the governing boards on the allocation formula. The Commission has always based its allocation decisions on statutory mandates for consideration of both stability of funding and enrollment growth.

SUMMARY

In recent years Colorado public institutions have not always experienced real dollar increases on a per student basis. Although the current system of mandating that CCHE determine the allocation formula has been challenged by some, experience would suggest that the higher education funding ills have less to do with the allocation formula and process, and more to do with limited resources and increasing higher education enrollments. This is an area that the Postsecondary Master Plan will address in light of fiscal constraints and of proposed constitutional amendments being considered by the voters in November 1992.

CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION AND LONG-RANGE PLANNING

Sections 23-1-106; 23-5-102; 23-5-112; 2311-104(3)(b); 23-15-107(3); 23-15-115; 23-70-107; 23-70-115, C.R.S.)

HISTORY

From 1976 to 1981, current CCHE responsibilities for capital construction and long range planning were administered by the Office of State Planning and Budgeting. In 1981, the General Assembly directed CCHE to establish a capital assets planning, programming and budgeting process.

DIRECTIVE

HB1187 expanded CCHE duties to ensure conformity of facilities planning with approved educational plans, and to annually establish a unified state five year capital improvements program coordinated with educational plans, and to recommend to the Governor and the General Assembly funding priorities for the system of public higher education. The scope of approval authority was extended to include local district colleges.

RESPONSE

The Commission has filled a strong legislative need for independent analysis and prioritization of the higher education system capital needs. In 1991-92, CCHE established a unified ten year capital improvement program, scheduling $440 million in future state-funded capital construction projects in accordance with educational plans. Further, CCHE reviewed and acted on eight facility Master Plans and 54 program and financial plans for state and self-funded improvements valued at more than $81 million. As directed by HB1187, CCHE has assured the General Assembly that all funding recommendations are based on approved program and financial plans, and are prioritized to provide a safe and healthful physical environment conducive to learning, and educational facilities that meet the essential needs of the Colorado public higher education system.

SUMMARY

Although the capital construction and long-range planning functions of CCHE have operated in an exemplary fashion, given the proposed constitutional amendment, known as "GREAT OUTDOORS COLORADO", and other fiscal constraints, this area of statute may require some revision to respond to these outside factors.

PROGRAM APPROVAL, REVIEW, REDUCTION AND DISCONTINUANCE
(Sections 23-1-107, 23-1-115 and 116, C.R.S.)

HISTORY

One of the main purposes for the establishment of CCHE in the mid-1960's was for the review and approval of degree programs. This is one of CCHE's traditional and essential responsibilities. HB1187 reaffirmed that role. Prior to HB1187, CCHE held no specific statutory responsibility in the area of teacher education.

DIRECTIVE

Through HB1187 the General Assembly reaffirmed CCHE responsibilities for program approval and review, and empowered CCHE with the functions of program reduction and discontinuance. Section 23-1-115 directs the CCHE to develop procedures and criteria for the discontinuance of existing academic programs while taking into account geographic factors and the educational needs of the state. Section 23-1-116, requires that CCHE close, consolidate, centralize, and reduce the undergraduate and graduate programs in teacher education.

RESPONSE

Approval. The CCHE response to this mandate was to balance systemwide coordination and efficiency with diversity of educational opportunities for Colorado citizens. Since 1985, CCHE has approved 7 academic level sub-baccalaureate programs, 25 baccalaureate programs, 17 masters level, 1 first professional and 15 doctoral programs. In addition, 103 certificate programs and 44 vocational A.A.S. programs were approved. The Commission

also monitors these newly-approved programs annually during the first five years of implementation to ensure that the programs are meeting their original objectives.

The academic program is the essence of an institution and changes in the program offerings are the most significant changes that an institution can make. The Commission's statutory role in this process is to weigh the intrinsic merit of the proposal against the statewide needs by determining whether a proposed new program:

- is compatible with the statutory role and mission of the institution;
- fits within the governing boards' priorities;
- meets accepted standards of quality for the type and level of the proposed program;
- fulfills a need in the state;
- will be supported with the resources necessary to offer a quality educational experience;
- unnecessarily duplicates an existing program; and
- supports and sustains economic development, if asserted.

Review. The Commission has also monitored the process of governing board and institutional quality reviews of existing academic programs at all institutions. Under the existing program review policy, each governing board reviews every educational program at least once in a seven year period.

Discontinuance. In response to the HB1187 mandate and after consultation with the governing boards, CCHE established a program discontinuance policy. The program discontinuance effort evolved into three distinct projects:

- The Teacher Education Project included the review of the 67 teacher education programs. Although many of the four-year postsecondary colleges provide the course that meet the teacher education licensure and certification requirements, the General Assembly designated the University of Northern Colorado and the University of Colorado at Denver as the primary teacher education programs. At this time, only these institutions offer the full array of teacher education degree programs.

- The Systemwide Reduction and Discontinuance Project occurred during 1986-87, 1987-88, and 1988-89 and included all programs except teacher education. As a result of this intensive study, CCHE has reviewed 1,154 programs, and discontinued approximately 120. (Included in this number are the 53 programs voluntarily discontinued by governing boards.)

- The Graduate Differentiation Project included only duplicate graduate programs. The Commission reviews these to determine if the state needs all, or only some of these programs, based on student demand and inherent differentiation of curriculum.

Teacher Education. After the passage of HB1187, CCHE undertook a comprehensive study of teacher education which resulted in numerous directives and recommendations impacting the provision of education programs in Colorado. As result of CCHE action, many programs in education have been discontinued, and there is no longer an undergraduate education major in Colorado. Students who wish to teach most subjects must now major in an academic subject area, and may take no more than 42 semester hours of teacher education courses in their undergraduate program. Music education programs that were not accredited have been discontinued.

In 1989 CCHE staff began a review of the directives and recommendations contained in its 1986 report. This review indicated a lack of compliance by certain institutions of some CCHE recommendations. Working with the relevant governing boards, CCHE developed procedures which ensured that all institutions were in compliance with CCHE and legislative intent.

SUMMARY

This section of HB1187 should be updated to reflect completed directives and to eliminate obsolete sections. The program review reduction and discontinuance charge is essential to the effectiveness of CCHE. The General Assembly and CCHE may need to amend this language in light of fiscal constraints and proposed constitutional amendments.

ADMISSION STANDARDS
(Sections 23-1-113(1) and (2), C.R.S.)

HISTORY

Prior to HB1187, CCHE did not have authority to set admission standards. Although the Joint Budget Committee raised the issue of setting admission standards, it was not until HB1187 that the General Assembly provided direction and authority to the CCHE for admissions standards.

DIRECTIVE

Section 23-1-113, C.R.S. directed CCHE to adopt academic admission standards for first-time freshmen and undergraduate transfer students at all state-supported baccalaureate and graduate institutions in the state. The legislation directed CCHE to include certain criteria, including at least two of the following: high school class rank, standardized test scores, and high school grade point average. Statute further indicated that transfer students should be admitted on the basis of criteria including college class rank. Additionally, statute outlined the role and mission of each state-supported institution and grouped them according to the degree of selectivity to be used when admitting new students. The tiers established were highly selective, selective, moderately selective and modified open.

RESPONSE

The Commission adopted an admission standards policy in October 1986, and directed governing boards to implement these standards in the fall of 1987. The CCHE Admission Standards Policy defines a set of minimum standards for each institution based on previous high school performance and scores on standardized tests. The standards are consistent with the level of selectivity of each institution.

The policy also sets forth standards for transfer student admission. The statutory requirement that college class rank be used as one element for determining transfer student admission is essentially impossible to implement because "class rank" in not computed at the collegiate level. This is an area that should be removed in future legislation.

Policies for both first-time freshmen and transfer students include a 20 percent admissions window, allowing 20 percent of the admitted students to be accepted without meeting the admission requirements.

The Commission has begun a review of the 1986 admission standards. Initial results from this policy impact evaluation indicate that in the period between fall 1985 and fall 1989, the total number of first-time freshmen at four-year institutions meeting the new standards increased 30 percent (7,680 to 9,995). Research also shows that first time freshmen minority access is up, that transfers from 2-year to 4-year institutions have increased, and that overall systemwide access has increased. This research indicates that many of CCHE goals for the admission standards policy are being met.

SUMMARY

The admission standards policy appears to be meeting the goals for which it was developed and does not need major revision at this time. If, however, funding continues to lag behind enrollment, the General Assembly and CCHE might need to revisit this issue as a means of managing enrollments. The CCHE should pursue legislation to eliminate any reference to "college class rank" in this section of the statute.

TUITION RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS
(Section 23-1-112, C.R.S.)

HISTORY

Prior to HB1187 CCHE had authority to establish reciprocal agreements and to waive residential tuition differentials through the financial aid statutes. HB1187 reinforced this authority.

DIRECTIVE

HB1187 directs CCHE to identify those circumstances where a waiver of the nonresident differential in tuition rates, on a reciprocal basis with other states, would enhance

educational opportunities for Colorado residents. The law also requires that CCHE negotiate with other states to establish reciprocal agreements.

RESPONSE

The Commission has established the Colorado Educational Exchange Program which permits Colorado public college students to attend an institution of the National Student Exchange (NSE) program for one year at that institution's in-state rates or to attend an institution of higher education at a rate close to the in-state rate. In exchange, students from participating NSE or foreign institutions may attend an eligible Colorado institution at in-state rates. The Commission also participates in the Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education (WICHE), Western Undergraduate Exchange and the Regional Graduate Program, which permits residents of 12 western states to participate in designated two-year, four-year, and 90 graduate programs at more than 30 institutions. Students either pay resident tuition at publicly supported institutions or substantially reduced tuition at private institutions. In addition, Colorado has an in-state tuition reciprocal agreement with the State of New Mexico in which 278 students from each state attend institutions in the reciprocal state at the in-state tuition rate.

SUMMARY

There does not appear to be any changes needed to this section, unless the General Assembly wishes to reconsider its commitment to these programs.

OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS
(Sections 23-1-109, C.R.S.)

HISTORY

Although, Colorado residents have had access to higher education courses through off-campus offerings, access to complete degree programs have been more limited. State funding for off-campus instruction was not authorized prior to HB1187. Educational service delivery areas have been designated by CCHE to coordinate off-campus instruction since 1972, but were not required for all institutions by statute prior to the 1985 legislation.

DIRECTIVE

HB1187 mandated that service areas be designated for all state-supported institutions of higher education. It also directed that CCHE administer any centralized statewide extension and continuing education program, including instruction delivered by television or other technological means. Further, the statute directed to CCHE to set policies to define which programs of instruction taught off-campus are eligible for general fund support.

RESPONSE

Following HB1187 authorization of state funding for needed off-campus instruction, CCHE established a program of off-campus graduate degrees for educators, the area of most pressing need. In 1990, CCHE created a wider off-campus degree program, the Off-

Campus State-Funded Program, that delivers a broad array of certificate programs and off-campus degrees from all fields at either the undergraduate or graduate level. By 1990-91 33 degree programs were offered at 51 sites, 34 of them rural.

HB1187 continued CCHE mandate to deliver a statewide program of courses (which do not receive state financial support) and identified television and other technologies as media for delivery of CCHE-coordinated off-campus instruction. There have been 600,000 enrollments in off-campus courses since 1986-87. CCHE policies ensure a coordinated program, unnecessary course duplication and high quality standards to off-campus instruction. CCHE also defined service areas for each institution. These service areas are used in organizing the off-campus programs.

Through cooperation with the Colorado Telecommunications Advisory Commission, a new plan for the establishment of a statewide telecommunications network has begun. This network with eventually facilitate the delivery of instruction to local school districts and other organizations in the state. The work of the Advisory Commission is proceeding with CCHE involvement.

SUMMARY

There does not appear to be any pressing reason to revise this section of HB1187. As the demand for service grows in rural and urban areas, however, CCHE and the General Assembly must address the question of what types of access it values the most and how that access to higher education should be prioritized. This issue is being explored further in Master Plan Issue Paper #2.

SYSTEMWIDE PLANNING
(Sections 23-1-108(1) and (2), C.R.S.)

HISTORY

Prior to HB1187, CCHE engaged in systemwide planning issues, especially master planning, but CCHE had less authority to implement these plans. For example, CCHE did not have the authority to set role and missions, tuition policies. In addition, CCHE's database was primarily based on annual surveys collected from the institutions and on ad hoc data requests to respond to specific issue.

DIRECTIVE

This section assigned CCHE major planning responsibilities including the following:

- the establishment of role and mission statements in accordance with the statutory framework;
- admission standards (reviewed earlier);

- transfer agreements;
- data collection; and
- tuition and fee policy.

RESPONSE

The Commission has fully responded to most of the directives in this section; those directives are outlined below. There are three areas where CCHE, due to time and fiscal constraints, has not completed its responsibilities. Those areas are:

- development of criteria for determining institutional closure and consolidation;
- report on institutional and board performance and responsiveness to statewide objectives contained in the Postsecondary Education Master Plan; and
- development of a plan to encourage in-state faculty training, promotion and recruitment.

Role and Mission

In February 1988 CCHE published detailed role and mission statements that reinforced statute. The statements distinguished the unique role and mission of each public institution within the postsecondary system. The CCHE statewide transfer policy created the Transfer Advisory Council, defined a common transfer guide format, and requires an annual faculty transfer conference. In addition, the policy protects student interests by ensuring a transfer dispute grievance process on each campus. The differentiation of roles and missions within the system has created opportunities for diverse educational programs at various levels of academic competitiveness.

Transfer Agreements

In 1988, CCHE established a statewide transfer policy. In 1987 the State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education, in conjunction with CCHE, defined a statewide core curriculum, a limited set of courses that meet the general education requirements at any public university or college in Colorado. Under CCHE policy, each four-year institution was required to develop and transfer guides for certain programs. These guides, used for course planning and transcript evaluation, allow Colorado community college transfer students to meet all graduation requirements for the baccalaureate degree within the normal time frame afforded native students. In addition, several institutions have developed a memorandum of understanding that recognizes community college students who complete a minimum of 60 hours as juniors.

Data Collection

The nationally recognized Student Unit Record Data System (SURDS), created in 1987, allows CCHE to collect and analyze information in many areas including student admission, performance, persistence and completion. This system has demonstrated its usefulness by making longitudinal data available for analysis by CCHE and for informational purposes to the public and policy makers.

Tuition and Fees

The CCHE established tuition and fee policies, developed in 1988 for implementation in FY 1989-90, state that undergraduate tuition for full-time students, except at the Colorado School of Mines, shall be at least 25 percent, but not more than 30 percent of the cost of the academic program. The policy further requires that the maximum increase in tuition be twice the rate of the increase in the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI). In addition to the limits put on tuition as a percent of costs and on tuition increases, the CCHE policy contains one more means for assuring access. Any institution with a tuition increase over the greater of the rate of HEPI or the rate of increase in state need-based financial aid must designate a percentage of the revenue generated by such increase to be used for need-based student financial assistance.

SUMMARY

As the state fiscal environment changes and demands on higher education increase, the systemwide planning role of CCHE continues to grow in importance. The tuition and fee policy may be an area that CCHE needs to revise in light of state resources. The current authority vested in CCHE may be sufficient to make some policy changes without seeking statutory amendments. I, however, the tax limitation proposal is approved in November 1992, the tuition and fee statute may require revision.

ACCOUNTABILITY
(Section 23-13-101, et.seq.)

HISTORY

Accountability was not part of CCHE responsibilities prior to HB1187.

DIRECTIVE

HB1187 requires the CCHE to develop a policy and procedure to be used by each public higher education institution to "design and implement a systematic program to assess the knowledge, capacities, and skills developed by students in academic and co-curricular programs." Four specific directive were included, as follows.

1. **That institutions of higher education be held accountable for demonstrable improvements in student knowledge, capacities, and skills between entrance and graduation.**

2. **That these demonstrable improvements be publicly announced and available.**

3. **That institutions express clearly to students their expectations of student performance.**

4. **That these improvements be achieved efficiently through the effective use of student and institutional resources of time, effort, and money.**

Additionally, the institutions were directed to carry out these objectives with a high degree of public involvement and under the policy direction of CCHE. The Commission was given authority to withhold two percent of the appropriation for any institution failing to implement any part of the accountability program.

RESPONSE

While the statute was passed in 1985, CCHE was allowed until 1990 to develop the program. In February 1988, CCHE adopted the policy for the Higher Education Accountability Program, which required institutions to submit goals and objectives by June 1988, an accountability plan by December 1988, and an annual report beginning fall 1989. Institutions had the opportunity to have their plans evaluated by CCHE prior to submission. By October 1989, the first plans were all accepted and categorized as excellent, satisfactory, or provisional. While CCHE has discussed the possibility of withholding the statutorily authorized two percent general fund appropriation, however, CCHE has not imposed this penalty. The Commission submitted its second accountability report to the General Assembly in January 1991. The second year of assessment recorded much progress by most institutions.

Directive one, requiring accountability for demonstrable improvements, was partially met through the establishment of the current accountability program. The reports describe significant progress of students attending Colorado institutions and receiving degrees, as well as serious concerns. CCHE has identified some of the common themes from the reports, including findings that student advising is deficient at many institutions, and that basic skills, teacher education assessment, and minority retention/graduation rates should all be improved. As follow-up to the accountability reports, CCHE has targeted each of these areas for further study because of their importance to the state as a whole.

Institutions meet the second directive of public dissemination of findings, by distributing assessment results in one or more of the following ways: to citizen advisory groups, to students through student publications or personal letters, to the news media, and internally to facilitate discussion about results and needed changes. Institutions meet the third directive by requiring publishing requirements in college catalogues, letters to students, student handbooks, or informing them during orientation sessions. In addition, CCHE is making some strides in improved communication with K-12 students through the LINCS Task Force.

Finally, the fourth directive requires that improvements be achieved efficiently. The cost of assessment for 1990 and 1991 totals approximately $5.4 million. The per student average was $17.72 in 1990, and $14.15 in 1991. It is difficult to judge whether the benefits of assessment outweigh the costs. The issue of accountability is explored in further depth in the Master Plan Issue Paper #4.

The Commission has fulfilled its statutory responsibility to monitor institutional accountability efforts and to report on those efforts to the legislature. Beyond the mandates

of HB1187, CCHE instituted a ScoreCard on Public Higher Education. The purpose of the ScoreCard is to provide educators, public policy makers, and the public with a measurement of the performance of Colorado college students, and the higher education system as a whole. Data is provided on students, degrees, faculty, and higher education finance. Through the Scorecard, CCHE provides Colorado citizens with an additional tool to evaluate the level of educational quality, access, and diversity that their investment in higher education supports.

SUMMARY

Accountability continues to be an area of major focus for CCHE. Through the current Postsecondary Education Master Planning process some changes to the program and policy may be recommended. In particular, CCHE and the General Assembly may wish to review the cost and benefit of the current program and the costs of expanding accountability and assessment efforts.

PROGRAMS OF EXCELLENCE
(Section 23-1-118, C.R.S.)

HISTORY

Prior to HB1187, the only grant program CCHE administered was the Organized Research Grant. In the first year, $1 million dollars was reallocated from the University of Colorado at Boulder and the Colorado State University budget lines to fund special initiatives. During each of the two succeeding years, the program dollars were decreased by half.

DIRECTIVE

In 1985, the legislature established a Quality Incentive Grant Program. By statute CCHE was charged with developing and administering a policy for the program. The Commission policy established two programs: a program for the recognition of demonstrated excellence, and a program for the promotion and encouragement of excellence. The recognition program was limited to $50,000 and any project or activity were eligible. In contrast, the range of awards was unlimited for the promotion and encouragement of excellence program, and only undergraduate initiatives and advanced technology projects were eligible.

In the 1988 session, the Programs of Excellence law replaced the Quality of Incentive Grant Program, limiting the number of awards to a maximum of five per year. The Programs of Excellence statute reflects a change from the previous program by focusing on existing academic programs that directly enroll students. The current law further prioritizes programs that exemplify undergraduate education, foster coordination among the postsecondary institutions, and promote economic development. It also recognizes that promoting excellence requires sustained effort and allows for a five-year enhancement funding cycle. This statute was modified in 1990 to give special consideration to programs

that are responsive to educator licensure reform outlined in Article 60.5 of Title 22, C.R.S.

RESPONSE

In the two years of Quality Incentive Grant Program existence, it directed awards ranging from $20,000 to $244,000 to 29 programs. The Programs of Excellence program directs $3 million of indirect cost recovery dollars to fund the various programs. During the four years of its existence, a total of 19 programs at Colorado public postsecondary institutions have been recognized. To win an award, educational programs must demonstrate a commitment to the quality of the educational experience, the quality of the faculty, and the quality of the students. As a direct result of being selected for this honor, these programs secured an additional $8.9 million in federal and corporate dollars and $430,000 in equipment, leveraging Colorado's investment to three times its value.

SUMMARY

This section of HB1187 appears to be well implemented and benefits both the state and the educational system. The Incentives for Improvement Program, approved by the General assembly in 1992, will complement the recognition portion of incentive funding.

CONCLUSION

Implementation of the mandates of HB1187 have fully occupied CCHE and its staff since passage of the legislation in 1985. As this review demonstrates, CCHE has been successful in developing policies, procedures and studies that satisfy the major directives and reinforce the goals of HB1187. In the years ahead, CCHE will need to refine and monitor many of its policies to ensure their effectiveness. Many of the programs and policies mandated by HB1187 have not been in effect long enough to complete an informed analysis of their effectiveness. This review, however, suggests that CCHE and General Assembly may need to revisit some areas of the legislation if the state's fiscal resources continue to decline and if certain proposed constitutional amendments are approved thereby forcing changes in current higher education policy. In addition, certain areas of statute are recommended for clarifying amendments.

Prepared by The Colorado Commission on Higher Education
September 1992